

### REMARKS

The Office Action of September 4, 2009, rejected all pending claims 1-4, 9-13, 15-22, 27-31, and 33-37. Applicants have amended claims 1, 18, and 19. As such, claims 1-4, 9-13, 15-22, 27-31, and 33-37 are pending, of which claims 1, 18, and 19 are independent. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9-12, 15-19, 21, 22, 27-30, and 33-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson (U.S. Patent No. 6,668,253). Dependent claims 2 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of SAMS Teach Yourself Microsoft Access 2000 (Access). Dependent claims 13 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of Bata (U.S. Patent No. 6,901,403).

Without conceding the correctness of the rejections and in order to advance prosecution on the merits, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 18, and 19 to define more particularly the subject matter sought to be patented. The amendments add no new matter. Support for the amendments appear in the specification as originally filed, for example, in Figures 2-3 and the accompanying textual description (e.g., paragraphs [0026]-[0029]).

Applicants submit that claims 1 and 19 as amended are directed to subject matter that is patentable over Thompson. For example, the Thompson reference does not disclose or suggest, as recited in Applicants' claims 1 and 19, as amended, the steps of (a) defining a report layout using the electronic business content structure and the selected attributes, wherein the report layout defines the structure of one or more reports, (b) determining, at the reporting run-time, one of a plurality of external computer-implemented reporting applications for use in generating the report, or (c) launching the determined reporting application using the output electronic file and generating the report in the determined reporting application according to the previously

defined report layout. As discussed in further detail herein, Thompson fails to disclose or suggest at least these features of each of claims 1 and 19.

The Thompson reference, by contrast, includes the ability to integrate “third party software packages to accomplish some of the report generation and execution...” (col. 8, lns. 31-34). This integration ability is further discussed in col. 30, lns. 30-39, as a “purchase of a third party product for use in reporting and analysis.” Thompson discusses integrating a single vendor (MicroStrategy 5.0) product suite into its solution for purposes of reporting and analysis. Thus, Thompson does not provide the ability to determine, at report run-time, which one of several external reporting applications can be used to generate a number of reports from a previously created selection of objects and attributes in a particular predefined layout. In fact, Thompson only provides the ability to run a report in a single reporting program selected at the time of creating the EIM software. This single reporting program would have to have been hard-coded into the system of Thompson for reporting and analysis purposes. Thus, Thompson’s single reporting program does not contemplate Applicants’ steps (a), (b), or (c) above because Thompson only allows report generation in one external reporting application *within* the EIM software.

The other references cited in the office action do not cure the deficiencies of Thompson. Like the Thompson reference, the Access and Bata references fail to render Applicants’ independent claims obvious because Applicants’ claimed subject matter can provide embodiments with features and advantages the cited references do not suggest or even contemplate. For example, Applicants’ claimed subject matter can “facilitate easy integration of external reporting tools.” (Spec. [0035]) The external reporting tools “can be supported without having to make coding changes to existing modules,” which can ensure that “system downtime can be minimized” (Spec. [0010]) and users need not be “adept application programmers to design business content for a report or chart to be generated in an external reporting tool application.” (Spec. [0004])

Claim 18 contains features that are similar, but not identical to the features described above for claims 1 and 19, and is therefore allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1

and 19. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claims 1, 18, and 19.

Claims 2-4, 9-13, 15-17, 20-22, 27-31, and 33-37 are variously dependent on claims 1, 18, or 19 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1, 18, and 19. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claims 2-4, 9-13, 15-17, 20-22, 27-31, and 33-37.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants submit that claims 1-4, 9-13, 15-22, 27-31, and 33-37 are in condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : Ankur Bhatt et al.  
Serial No. : 10/648,108  
Filed : August 26, 2003  
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-0123001 / 2003P00283 US01

Please charge deposit account 06-1050 in the amount of \$490 for the Petition for  
Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 28, 2010

/Kristen J. Hansen/  
Kristen J. Hansen  
Reg. No. 63,526

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
3200 RBC Plaza  
60 South Sixth Street  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
Telephone: (612) 335-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945